

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2 and 4-15 are pending in the above-identified application. Support for the changes to claim 1 is found in claim 3 (inserted into claim 1); lines 6-10 of claim 10; lines 12-17 of claims 10; Substitute Specification page 29, line 24 to page 30, line 8; and Substitute Specification page 60, lines 1-5. The specification has been amended so as to correctly spell the term "cyano".

#### **Removal of Bases for Rejection under 35 USC 112**

Claims 4, 5 and 7-12 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as alleging being indefinite because of improper antecedent bases as noted at page 2 of the Office Action of June 19, 2006. In view of the changes to claim 1, as well as the other changes made to the claims it is submitted that all of the presently pending claims have proper antecedent bases and comply with all requirements of definiteness under 35 USC 112. In addition, it is noted that claims 7-10 have been objected to because these claims recite measurement methods. In response to this objection, it is noted that these claims properly refer to properties of the conductive roller of the present invention, along with describing the measurement methods for determining these properties. This is completely appropriate under the requirements of 35 USC 112. Thus, it is requested that the above-noted rejection be withdrawn.

#### **Removal of Bases for Rejections under 35 USC 102(e) and 103(a)**

Claims 1-9 and 15 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Harada '587 (USP 6,697,587).

Claims 7-9 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada '587.

Claims 10-14 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada '587 in view of Takagi '434 (USP 6,067,434).

The above-noted rejections are traversed based on the following reasons.

*Present Invention and Its Advantages*

The present invention is directed to a conductive roller, which includes an ion-containing salt, among other components, as recited in claim 1. The conductive roller of the present invention exhibits advantageous mechanical properties, such as a low compression set and hardness, as noted, for example, at page 23, lines 16-22 of the Substitute Specification.

*Distinctions Between Present Invention and Cited References*

Both Harada '587 and Takagi '434 fail to disclose or suggest the use of the specific ion-containing salt employed in the conductive roll of the present invention. Thus, significant patentable distinctions exist between the present invention and these references. Further, these references fail to recognize the advantages achieved by the present invention as noted above. Consequently, the above-noted rejections based on these references should be withdrawn.

It is submitted for the reasons above that the present claims define patentable subject matter such that this application should now be placed in condition for allowance.

If any questions arise in the above matters, please contact Applicant's representative, Andrew D. Meikle (Reg. No. 32,868), in the Washington Metropolitan Area at the phone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Andrew D. Meikle

Registration No.: 32,868

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorneys for Applicant